



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,485	05/03/2006	Harald Fischer	CH 020030	4979
7590 08/13/2007 Corporate Patent Counsel Philips Electronics North America Corporation P O Box 3001 Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/525,485

Applicant(s)

FISCHER, HARALD

Examiner

Tuan H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20-23,29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20-23,29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 05/15/2007 with respect to claims 1-18, 20-23 and 29-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 20 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaura (U.S PAT. 5,809,405).

Consider claim 1, Yamaura teaches transceiver apparatus for use in a multi-frequency communication system, comprising: a signal processor (180) (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 42-55), an antenna-switch (120) comprising a multi-switch (121-124), a transmission-multiplexer (140) and a reception multiplexer (160), wherein said multiplexers are controllable by the signal processor (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 42-55), a frequency conversion circuitry having a transmission path (fig. 3 col. 7 lines 53-58) and

Art Unit: 2618

a reception path wherein each of the paths communicatively connects the signal processor and the antenna-switch (fig. 5 col. 10 lines 52-60) and an antenna terminal having plurality of antenna having a transmission-connector for connecting the transmission path to the antenna and a reception-connector for connecting the reception path to the antenna (col. 3 line 53 through col. 4 line 19), wherein the antenna-switch, controllable by the signal processor, allows multi-frequency operation of the antenna-terminal by combining a transmission-mode and a reception-mode of each of the plurality of antenna (fig. 5 col. 9 lines 54-63).

Consider claim 20, Yamaura teaches a method of transceiving a multi-frequency signal in a multi-frequency communication system, comprising the steps of: processing the signal in a signal processor (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 42-55) operating an antenna terminal by an antenna-switch comprising a multi-switch, a transmission multiplexer and a reception multiplexer, wherein the multiplexers are controlled by the signal processor (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 42-55), and transceiving the signal by means of at least a selected one of a plurality of antenna of the antenna terminal, frequency converting the signal in a frequency conversion circuitry wherein frequency converting of the signal in the frequency conversion circuitry is established on a transmission path (fig. 3 col. 7 lines 53-58) and a reception path (fig. 5 col. 10 lines 52-60), wherein each of the paths communicates the signal between the signal processor and the antenna switch, wherein multi-frequency antenna terminal operation is established by combining a transmission-mode of the antenna and a reception-mode of the antenna controlled by the signal

Art Unit: 2618

processor (col. 3 line 53 through col. 4 line 19), by means of: the antenna- switch, and communicating the signal between the transmission path and the selected antenna via the transmission multiplexer and a transmission connector of the antenna and between the reception path and the selected antenna via the reception multiplexer and a reception connector of the selected antenna (fig. 5 col. 9 lines 54-63).

Consider claim 29, Yamaura teaches a communications method using a communications transceiver having multiple antennas having respective switches, a transmission path (fig. 3 col. 7 lines 53-58), a reception path (fig. 5 col. 10 lines 52-60), a transmission multiplexer, a reception multiplexer, and a processor (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 42-55), comprising: the processor controlling the transmission multiplexer and the reception multiplexer such that during transmission the transmission path is coupled to a selected antenna and during reception the reception path is coupled to a selected antenna (col. 3 line 53 through col. 4 line 19); and the processor controlling the respective switches of the multiple antennas such that, at a particular instant in time, each of the multiple antennas is configured as either a transmit antenna or a receive antenna (fig. 5 col. 9 lines 54-63).

Consider claim 30, Yamaura teaches communications transceiver comprising: multiple antennas having respective switches; a transmission path (fig. 3 col. 7 lines 53-58); a reception path (fig. 5 col. 10 lines 52-60); a transmission multiplexer coupled to the transmission path and to multiple antennas; a reception multiplexer coupled to the

Art Unit: 2618

reception path and to multiple antennas (col. 3 line 53 through col. 4 line 19); and a processor (fig. 3 col. 5 lines 42-55); wherein the processor controls the transmission multiplexer and the reception multiplexer such that during transmission the transmission path is coupled to a selected antenna and during reception the reception path is coupled to a selected antenna (col. 3 line 53 through col. 4 line 19); and wherein the processor controls the respective switches of the multiple antennas such that, at a particular instant in time, each of the multiple antennas is configured as either a transmit antenna or a receive antenna (fig. 5 col. 9 lines 54-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-5 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaura in view of Heinonen Jarmo (European Patent Application EP 0 800 283 hereinafter, "Heinonen").

Consider claim 2, Yamaura teaches transceiver apparatus for use in a multi-frequency communication system.

Yamaura does not explicitly show that characterized in that the signal processor is an analogue-digital signal processor formed by a direct digital synthesizer driven phase locked loop radio frequency signal generator.

In the same field of endeavor, Heinonen teaches characterized in that the signal processor is an analogue-digital signal processor formed by a direct digital synthesizer driven phase locked loop radio frequency signal generator (col. 8 line 50 through col. 9 line 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, characterized in that the signal processor is an analogue-digital signal processor formed by a direct digital synthesizer driven phase locked loop radio frequency signal generator, as taught by Heinonen, in order to provide a transmitter/receiver for transmitting and receiving of an RF signal in two frequency bands.

Consider claim 3, Heinonen further teaches characterized in that the frequency conversion circuitry comprises at least one of a local oscillator and a power divider to supply a local oscillator power to the transmission path and/or the reception path (col. 8 line 50 through col. 9 line 7).

Consider claim 4, Heinonen further teaches characterized in that the frequency conversion circuitry comprises a mixer device for converting the signal between an

intermediate frequency and a radio frequency (col. 6 lines 21-30).

Consider claim 5, Heinonen further teaches characterized in that the frequency conversion circuitry comprises a direct conversion device for converting the signal between a base band frequency (zero IF) and a radio frequency, in particular by means of an IQ-method (col. 6 lines 7-20).

Consider claim 21, Yamaura teaches a method of transceiving a multi-frequency signal in a multi-frequency communication system.

Yamaura does not explicitly show that characterized by directly frequency converting the signal in a frequency conversion circuitry between a base band signal (zero IF) and a radio frequency signal.

In the same field of endeavor, Heinonen teaches characterized by directly frequency converting the signal in a frequency conversion circuitry between a base band signal (zero IF) and a radio frequency signal (col. 6 lines 7-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, characterized by directly frequency converting the signal in a frequency conversion circuitry between a base band signal (zero IF) and a radio frequency signal, as taught by Heinonen, in order to provide a transmitter/receiver for transmitting and receiving of an RF signal in two frequency bands.

Consider claim 22, Heinonen further teaches characterized by frequency converting the signal in a frequency conversion circuitry between an intermediate frequency signal and a radio frequency signal (col. 6 lines 21-30).

Consider claim 23, Heinonen further teaches characterized in that a reference of an incoming signal is processed in an antenna switch after checking a beam direction and a signal quality, in particular based on a BER-measurement (col. 1 line 53 through col. 2 line 3 e.g., digital processing included BER measurement to check a signal quality of an incoming signal).

6. Claims 6-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaura in view of Heinonen and further in view of Garlepp et al. (U.S PUB. 2003/0017809 hereinafter, "Garlepp").

Consider claim 6, Yamaura and Heinonen, in combination, fails to teaches characterized in that the antenna switch comprises a matching unit formed as a frequency regulated matching filter in order to provide an optimal matching factor for the antenna.

However, Garlepp teaches characterized in that the antenna switch comprises a matching unit formed as a frequency regulated matching filter in order to provide an optimal matching factor for the antenna (page 17 [0189]).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Garlepp into view of Yamaura and Heinonen, in order to provide impedance matching in the front-end circuitry of RF apparatus.

Consider claim 7, Garlepp further teaches characterized in that the antenna switch comprises a bus connection to the signal processor, wherein the bus-connection is formed as a matching network (page 1 [0007]).

Consider claim 10, Garlepp further teaches characterized in that the antenna terminal comprises a patching unit formed as a low-pass-filter to improve the matching of the antenna for different frequencies and/or for different modes of a multi-frequency communication system, in particular of a mobile cellular communication system or a personal communication system (page 21 [0241]).

Consider claim 11, Garlepp further teaches characterized in that the antenna terminal comprises a matching unit for the antenna, in particular an LC component, in order to provide an optimal matching factor for the antenna (page 22 [0275]).

7. Claims 8-9, 12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaura in view of Heinonen and further in view of Keskitalo et al. (U.S PAT. 6,128,486 hereinafter, "Keskitalo").

Consider claim 8, Yamaura and Heinonen, in combination, fails to teaches characterized in that the antenna switch further comprises a beam forming matrix device, in particular a Butler-output-matrix selected from the group consisting of: a 4x4, a 8x8 and a 16x16 Butler output matrix.

However, Keskitalo teaches characterized in that the antenna switch further comprises a beam forming matrix device, in particular a Butler-output-matrix selected from the group consisting of: a 4x4, a 8x8 and a 16x16 Butler output matrix (col. 9 lines 6-23).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Keskitalo into view of Yamaura and Heinonen, in order to simplify the baseband processing in the interference cancellation and in multi-user detection and thus to improve the capacity or sensitivity of the detector.

Consider claim 9, Keskitalo further teaches characterized in that matching units are provided inside the Butler-matrix, in particular a modified Butler-output matrix output/input is formed as a frequency regulated matching filter in order to provide an optimal matching factor for the antenna (col. 1 lines 36-46).

Consider claim 12, Keskitalo further teaches characterized in that the antenna terminal comprises at least two, in particular four, antennas (col. 3 line 63 through col. 4

Art Unit: 2618

line 12).

Consider claim 16, Keskitalo further teaches characterized in that the antenna has a body and the body comprises an integrated patching and/or matching unit (col. 1 lines 36-46).

Consider claim 17, Keskitalo further teaches characterized in that the antenna terminal forms a beam of 360 degrees, in particular the antenna beam is formed within a range of 200 degrees (col. 2 lines 18-37).

Consider claim 18, Keskitalo further teaches characterized in that the antenna beam comprises a 90 degree beam, in particular the beam is formed by a 50 degree main beam and two 20 degree side beams (col. 2 lines 18-37).

8. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaura in view of Heinonen and further in view of Cencich et al. (U.S PAT. 6,844,862 hereinafter, "Cencich").

Consider claim 13, Yamaura and Heinonen, in combination, fails to teaches characterized in that the antenna is formed as an s-loop antenna having two ends formed as the transmission connector and/or the reception connector.

However, Cencich teaches characterized in that the antenna is formed as an s-loop antenna having two ends formed as the transmission connector and/or the reception connector (col. 2 lines 40-53).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Cencich into view of Yamaura and Heinonen, in order to provide an antenna that provides high gain and wide-angle coverage with reduced size and weight, and that is particularly apt for spaceborne applications.

Consider claim 14, Cencich further teaches characterized in that the antenna is configured as a copper wired antenna, in particular as a flexible line antenna made of copper (col. 5 lines 32-39).

Consider claim 15, Cencich further teaches characterized in that the antenna is configured as a SMD-planar antenna (col. 5 lines 6-15).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2618

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop_____ (Explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-8329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am - 5:00Pm.

Art Unit: 2618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Maung Nay A. can be reached on (571) 272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information Consider the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2618

T.


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER